

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated August 14, 2003. Claims 25-33 are pending in this application, having been added to provide Applicant with a more complete scope of protection. Claims 1-24 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claim 25 is in independent form. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1-15 and 19-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,564,378 B1 (Satterfield). Claims 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Satterfield in view of U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2002/0010926 A1 (Lee). Cancellation of Claims 1-24 renders their rejections moot, but Applicant submits the following comments regarding the patentability of new Claims 25-33 over these cited references.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 25 is an information processing method including inputting video data and program information data into an apparatus. Video images of a first program derived from the input video data are displayed on a display device. In response to a change from the first program to a second program, program information for the second program derived from the program information data, together with video images of the second program derived from the input video data are displayed on the display device. A setting screen for setting program information display parameters is displayed, and the program information is displayed on the display device in accordance with the program information display parameters set using the setting screen.

Satterfield, as understood by Applicant, relates to displaying a program information screen (72) including a video image (76) for a program on a selected channel and information (78) relating to the program. Selection of the channel is performed in response to a key operation on a remote control (50). In contrast to the invention of Claim 25, Satterfield merely discusses selecting a channel for previewing in a program guide having a particular, fixed format, rather than displaying program information and associated video in a variable format in response to a channel change. More specifically, nothing has been found in Satterfield that teaches or suggests a setting screen for setting program information display parameters and displaying, in response to a program change, program information for a program together with video images of the program in accordance with the set parameters, as recited in Claim 25.

Lee, as understood by Applicant, relates to displaying program information for a program under certain conditions, such as when the channel is changed, and displaying information for a program to be broadcast next when a currently broadcast program approaches its end. Although Lee provides a screen (Fig. 3) for changing certain parameters relating to when the program information is displayed, there is no suggestion that the user may specify the format in which it is displayed. Nothing has been found in Lee that teaches or suggests a setting screen for setting program information display parameters and displaying, in response to a program change, program information for a program together with video images of the program in accordance with the set parameters, as recited in Claim 25. Thus, Lee does not remedy the deficiencies of Satterfield in this regard.

Applicant therefore submits that the combination of Satterfield and Lee, assuming such combination would even be permissible, would still fail to teach or suggest the features of Claim 25 discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 25 is allowable over these two patents, taken separately or in any proper combination.

The other rejected claims in this application depend from independent Claim 25, and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual consideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,


Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 43,279

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200